

RESPONSE

This is a response to the Office Action dated February 12, 2007. The Examiner rejected claims 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub 2004/0212640 (“Mann”). The examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub 2003/0065721 (“Roskind”), in view of Mann. The examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roskind, in view of Mann, further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,159,192 (“Dobronsky”). Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mann in view of Dobronsky.

The rejections from the Office Action of February 12, 2007 are discussed below. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-19 are amended for clarity. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 11-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mann. With this response, independent claim 11 and dependent claims 12-18 have been amended for clarity and not for reasons relating to patentability. Mann discloses an invention for “hosting tiles individually or in groups, within a side bar, for interaction by a user.” Mann ¶19. The “sidebar presents ... contacts,” Mann ¶73, and “a user can ... remove ... tiles.” Mann, ¶70. Thus, the user can remove a tile with contacts on it, hiding the contacts from the user. Mann further discloses that a user may “minimize the side bar while keeping access to the tiles”, Mann ¶97, and “as shown in display 1116 of Fig. 11C, the sidebar 1102 of Fig. 11A has been minimized.” Mann ¶99. In Fig. 11C when the user minimizes the sidebar the “messenger contacts” are hidden from the user. Mann, ¶97, Fig. 11C. Thus, since the user can hide all of the contacts from view, by either removing the tile or by minimizing the sidebar, Mann does not disclose “code for preventing a user from hiding all of the friends list page from view in the instant messenger window,” as claimed in amended independent claim 11.

Mann further discloses a “system and process for automatically providing dynamic communication access and information awareness in an interactive peripheral display without requiring a user to tab between communication channels or information types.” Mann, ¶17. Mann further discloses that “tiles are non-overlapping and are arranged in adjoining positions to

one another.” Mann, ¶46. Mann does not disclose “code for displaying content of a first interactive content page in the instant messenger window at the same time that at least a portion of the friends list page is displayed in the instant messenger window, wherein the content of the first interactive content page is displayed when the user selects a first tab in a tab selector region of the instant messenger window,” as claimed in amended independent claim 11.

Furthermore, Mann does not disclose “[t]he computer program product according to claim 15 wherein the content of the first interactive content page and the content of the second interactive content page overlap,” as claimed in amended dependent claim 16. Applicant submits Mann discloses that tiles are “non-overlapping” and “adjoining”, Mann, ¶46, while amended dependent claim 16 claims “the content of the first interactive content page and the content of the second interactive content page overlap.” Thus, Mann does not disclose the use of overlapping content pages arranged in a tab selector region, as claimed in amended dependent claim 16.

Lastly, the Examiner states that Mann “shows a flyout window that corresponds to selecting a tile on the invention for display.” Office Action of 02/12/07 pp. 6, 11, 12. Applicant submits that by definition a flyout “window” is a separate window from the contacts. Thus the content is not displayed “in the instant messenger window,” as claimed in amended independent claim 11 and amended dependent claim 15.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 11, and all claims that depend thereon, are patentable over Mann because Mann fails to disclose all of the elements of amended independent claim 11. Furthermore Applicant respectfully submits that amended dependent claims 15 and 16 are separately patentable over Mann because Mann fails to disclose all of the elements of amended dependent claims 15-16.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roskind in view of Mann. With this response, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-9 have been amended for clarity and not for reasons relating to patentability. The Examiner admits that Roskind fails to disclose “preventing a user from hiding all of the friends list page from view in the instant messenger window,” as claimed in independent claim 1. Office Action of 02/12/07 p.

8. As discussed above, Mann also fails to disclose “preventing a user from hiding all of the friends list page from view in the instant messenger window,” as claimed in amended independent claim 1.

The Examiner admits that Roskind fails to disclose “the method wherein displaying the content of the first content tab further comprises displaying the content of the first content tab when the user selects a first tab in a tab selector region of the instant messenger window,” as claimed in dependent claim 5. Office Action of 02/12/07 p. 11. As discussed above, Mann also fails to disclose any use of a tab selector region, as claimed in amended dependent claim 5.

Furthermore the Examiner admits that Roskind fails to disclose “displaying a content of a second tab in the instant messenger window when the user selects a second tab in the tab selector region, the second content tab being displayed at the same time that at least a portion of the friends list is also displayed in the instant messenger window,” as claimed in amended dependent claim 6. As discussed above, Mann also fails to disclose any use of a tab selector region, or any use of tabs, as claimed in amended dependent claim 6.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, and all claims that depend thereon, are patentable over Roskind in view of Mann because the combination of Roskind and Mann fails to disclose all of the elements of amended independent claim 1. Furthermore Applicant respectfully submits that amended dependent claims 5 and 6 are separately patentable over Roskind in view of Mann because the combination of Roskind and Mann fails to disclose all of the elements of dependent claim 5 and 6.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roskind, in view of Mann, and further in view of Dobronsky. With this response, dependent claim 10 has been amended for clarity and not for reasons relating to patentability. Dobronsky discloses a “virtual toolbar within an existing electronic message program.” Dobronsky, Col. 1, ln. 66 – Col. 2, ln. 1. Dobronsky does not disclose “preventing a user from hiding all of the friends list page from view in the instant messenger window,” as claimed in amended independent claim 1 from which amended dependent claim 10 depends. As shown above neither Mann nor Roskind discloses “preventing a user from hiding all of the friends list page from view in the instant messenger window,” as claimed in amended independent claim 1 from which amended independent claim 10 depends. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent

claim 10 is patentable over Roskind, in view of Mann and Dobronsky because the combination of Roskind, Mann and Dobronsky fails to disclose all of the elements of amended independent claim 1 from which amended dependent claim 10 depends.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mann in view of Dobronsky. With this response, dependent claim 19 has been amended for clarity and not for reasons relating to patentability. As shown above neither Dobronsky nor Mann disclose “code for preventing a user from hiding all of the friends list page from view in the instant messenger window,” as claimed in amended independent claim 11 from which amended dependent claim 19 depends. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that amended dependent claim 19 is patentable over Mann in view of Dobronsky because the combination of Mann and Dobronsky fails to disclose all of the elements of amended independent claim 11 from which amended dependent claim 19 depends..

CONCLUSION

Each of the rejections in the Office Action dated February 12, 2007 has been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

May 14, 2007
Date

/Michael G. Dreznes/
Michael G. Dreznes
Registration No. 59,965

Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200